DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 067 JC 810 638

AUTHOR Hansen, Desna W.; Rhodes, Dent M.
TITLE Staff Development through Degrees: Alternative to the Ph. D.
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the National Conference of the National Council of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (Philadelphia, PA, November 1-4, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Degree Requirements; *Doctoral Degrees; Doctoral Programs; Enrollment Influences; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Professional Continuing Education; Teacher Motivation

ABSTRACT

Most serious staff development programs share the characteristics of strong administrative support, needs-based planning, widespread faculty participation, and a well-defined program of activities. Unfortunately, these activities are often ad hoc affairs, influenced by what is fashionable and financially feasible. Formal degree programs can provide an alternative to ad hoc faculty development. Several degree options are available, including the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.), the Doctor of Education (Ed. D.) in College Teaching, the Doctor of Arts (D. A.), and the Ed. D. in Postsecondary Curriculum and Instruction. Though each of these program options has several advantages, faculty members should also be aware of several problematic considerations related to the pursuit of a degree: (1) the availability of degree programs; (2) whether they will teach full- or part-time; (3) monetary considerations; (4) their relationships with their instructors; and (5) the lack of the sense of community of many graduate programs. Once the faculty member has come to terms with these problems, he/she must decide on the appropriate degree. Several factors should influence this choice, including his/her career goals, perception of personal and professional roles, and feelings toward study and research. Whatever the instructor's ultimate choice, staff development directors and personnel can contribute in several important ways to the careers and professional development of faculty members. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210067

STAFF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH DEGREES: ALTERNATIVES to the Ph.D.

Presented at the Annual Meeting of
the National Council of
Staff, Program, and Organizational Development
in Philadelphia, PA
November, 1981

by

Desna W. Hansen
Lincoln Land Community College

Dent M. Rhodes
Illinois State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Desna W. Hanson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 810 638

STAFF DEVELOPMENT THROUGH DEGREES: ALTERNATIVES TO THE PhD

Staff Development Comes of Age

From tenuous beginnings in the early 1970's, staff (faculty) development has negotiated a perilous childhood, suffered through a turbulent adolescence, and is now approaching respectable adulthood. Evidences of the maturity of faculty development as a practical idea are readily apparent. Centra (1976) estimates that over half of the institutions of higher learning in the United States have instituted some form of faculty development programs. Organizations such as the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network and the National Council of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) have been established and are conducting regional and national conferences. Publishing in the area of faculty development in professional journals further attests to the high level of continuing interest in faculty development. In many institutions, even in a time of declining material resources, staff development programs are being spared as budgets are slashed in other areas. Faculty development programs are no longer considered as frills, but rather as necessities, especially in a time of decreasing faculty mobility.

As faculty members experience an increasing sense of being placebound, they are resigned to spending more of their professional lives linked to a single institution. It is vital for the health of that institution to provide the resources to help faculty develop professionally in a productive way and to resist the common phenomenon of burnout. Because human resources need to be preserved, renewed, and cultivated, staff development programs frequently become the vehicle for professional growth and renewal. Increasingly, these programs are headed by dedicated,

full time professionals, rather than by volunteers, by committees, by a faculty member with minimal released time from teaching duties, or by a mid-level administrator with faculty development as a low priority responsibility. Faculty development programs have come of age.

In the course of their maturation, these programs have come to conceive staff development in a number of different ways. Some have become broadly expansive, including administrators, classified staff, and para-professionals as well as faculty in their programs. Others have dealt only with faculty in a very limited way, addressing narrowly-defined concerns. Some programs have explored not only professional development, but also curricular, organizational, instructional, and personal development. In looking at the typical faculty development program, however, certain basic characteristics seem to be present in the majority of serious efforts:

(1) Strong administrative support, including adequate financing;

(2) Program planning based on generalized needs assessments;

(3) Substantial numbers of the total faculty involved in the program on a voluntary basis;

(4) Well-defined, organized program of activities.

Traditional Staff Development Activities

The fourth characteristic, a regular program of specific activities, has become institutionalized in many faculty development programs. Traditional activities encouraged and supported in conventional faculty development programs include workshops, seminars, released time, institutes, retreats, internal and external consulting, compensation for attendance at professional association meetings, faculty exchanges, sabbaticals, and graduate level course work. Frequently, however, these traditional activities are almost entirely ad hoc affairs, influenced by what is educationally fashionable and the availability of resources. They are

institutionally supported but the degree of support often depends upon the orientation of the institution and the interest of administrators. Obviously, this approach is unsystematic and fragmented from the vantage point of an individual faculty member. What is needed is a viable alternative to ad hoc faculty development. Formal degree programs can provide the focus and the systematic approach that is lacking in most traditional staff development activities.

Faculty members who choose to pursue formal degrees do so for various reasons. Some want to improve their marketability with thoughts of changing professional positions. Others may elect to pursue a degree to advance on a salary scale. Still others may believe they could teach more effectively and serve their students more conscientiously through pursuing an advanced degree. Staff development through formal degrees--what are the options?

Degree Options

The Ph.D. is of course the most widely known and accepted degree in American post-secondary education. The emphasis in most Ph.D. programs is to prepare research scholars in a discipline, or perhaps more accurately, in a subspecialization of a discipline. In Ph.D. programs the emphasis is on the research knowledge and skills need by a person who intends to produce new knowledge in a field of study. The Ph.D. has often been criticized as the degree least appropriate for those who wish to devote their efforts to the teaching of undergraduates in colleges and universities. Indeed, a degree program which focuses on narrow specialization in subject matter may well be a singularly inappropriate experience for an undergraduate teacher who needs to operate from a broad conceptual base and who frequently has little time or inclination for research. It seems unrealistic to continue to "rely exclusively on a graduate degree program that trains future teachers for a kind of work many of them will seldom or never do, a program that suggests in a hundred ways that what they will do is inferior to research, fails to prepare

them for their jobs, and nonetheless drags out their degree programs." (Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment, 1974, p. 40)

An alternative to the Ph.D. which has been available for some time, though only at a small number of institutions, is the Ed.D. in College Teaching. This degree emphasizes the teaching competencies needed by undergraduate teachers, with a strong component in a subject discipline. The Ed.D. in College Teaching combines study in a teaching field with work in educational research and teaching methodology. While this degree does seem appropriate for teachers of undergraduates, it has suffered from the reputation the Ed.D has as a degree for public school administrators and teacher educators.

Though there has been some interest at various institutions in designing a Ph.D. for teachers, the most significant work has been the development, during the past decade, of the D.A., the Doctor of Arts degree, now available at some twenty-six universities in the United States. The Doctor of Arts was first offered at Carnegie-Mellon University, and "was implemented to provide a doctoral level program of study for those qualified and interested in a career focusing on teaching the arts and sciences in two-year and four-year colleges." (Johnson, 1980, pp. 1-2) D.A. degrees include strong preparation in a subject matter and a career orientation appropriate for faculty members in undergraduate institutions. The D.A. is thus intended to avoid the problems associated with the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. in College Teaching: to be relevant to the actual careers of undergraduate teachers and to have the status associated with an academic discipline. (Dressel & Thompson, 1977, 1978)

There is, however, another group of individuals in two and four year colleges for whom neither the D.A. nor the Ed.D. in College Teaching may be appropriate. These two degrees focus on teaching while there are a number of other possible career options and opportunities which could be emphasized. The Ed.D. in Post-

Secondary Curriculum and Instruction is another alternative to the Ph.D. and to the D.A. and Ed.D. in College Teaching as well. The Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction emphasizes inquiry into professional problems related to the nature of curriculum and instruction in post-secondary education; these problems and their possible resolutions may be examined from a number of perspectives - historical, philosophical, empirical, pedagogical, administrative, counseling, disciplinary - to name only a few. Experienced faculty in two and four year colleges may wish to pursue a doctoral program related to personal and career goals which do not focus primarily on teaching or research. An individualized doctoral program in post-secondary curriculum and instruction can provide this opportunity.

The chart which follows summarizes the basic characteristics of these degree programs.

Ph.D.	D.A.; Ed.D. in College Teaching	Ed.D. in Curriculum & Instruction
Emphasis		
research	teaching	professional practice
Goal		
prepare research scholars in a discipline	improve and extend teaching competencies in one or more disciplines and/or related fields	improve and extend a range of professional competencies
Focus		
specialized area in a discipline	discipline; fields related to discipline	professional problems in curriculum and instruction

Ph.D.	D.A.; Ed.D. in College Teaching	Ed.D. in Curriculum & Instruction
Competencies		
knowledge and skills needed to carry on research in a discipline	increase knowledge of subject matter and skill in methods of teaching	knowledge and skill in problem analysis and research in curriculum and instruction
Purpose of Dissertation		
contribution to knowledge in a specialized area of a discipline	contribution to the improvement of teaching practice in a discipline	contribution to the identification and resolution of an instructional and/or curricular problem
Desired Outcome		
ability to design, evaluate, and conduct research in a discipline	ability to understand research in subject fields; devise, select and implement relevant teaching methods	ability to analyze instructional and curricular problems; to devise, select, and implement means to resolve the problems

Problem Areas

When considering individualized professional development through a formal degree program there are several potential problems which arise.

(1) Availability of degree programs. Of course, the most obvious concern to the faculty member investigating degree programs is the availability of a suitable program within reasonable commuting distance. Since most professionals pursue a degree on a part-time basis while performing full-time teaching duties, it is imperative that traveling to and from the program site does not become burdensome.

(2) Full or part-time attendance. Most faculty involved in staff development programs are already professionals employed in full-time positions.

If the faculty member plans to attend classes full-time, he/she is faced with the problem of negotiating released time or arranging for an academic leave. On the other hand, if the faculty member intends to enroll in only one or two courses, those can usually be taken during evening hours. Necessary courses, however, may not always be offered in the evening. Part-time status also brings the attendant problem of a greatly lengthened program of studies, often stretching over a period of five to ten years. Comprehensive written and oral examinations become less meaningful and the concentrated time periods necessary for research and the filling of the dissertation requirement become increasingly elusive.

(3) Monetary considerations. The costs involved in graduate programs vary widely. Cost may be a factor in determining full or part-time attendance. Additionally, a faculty member must consider the income lost from the regular professional position when pursuing a full-time course of studies.

(4) Individual maturity. A relatively high level of emotional and intellectual maturity is required of the professional re-entering the university. A willingness to accept and critically examine new ideas that may conflict with previously held beliefs is essential. Current practice may need to be re-evaluated as established, comfortable ways of thinking are challenged. Some degree of openmindedness and a willingness to take risks in new intellectual situations are necessary if an individual is to benefit from a formal degree program.

(5) Student-faculty relationships. Most faculty in doctoral programs other than the Ph.D. will not hold the specific degree they are granting nor will they likely have much teaching experience in institutions

such as the community college. Their expectations concerning appropriate subject matter for their students have often been formed by their experiences in Ph.D. programs and may differ from the expectations that practicing professionals in their courses may have. A few university faculty may indeed not wish to admit that their students are knowledgeable professionals. Students in the D.A. and Ed.D. programs will not be preparing for the same kinds of careers their instructors have pursued and may have difficulty finding faculty who can serve as appropriate mentors and role models.

(6) Sense of community. For several reasons, the sense of community that is a meaningful part of many doctoral programs may be lacking for the professional returning to graduate school. First, there will probably be marked age differences between the individual returning to school and the traditional doctoral student. Their interests, both within and without the academic setting, will be dissimilar as well. Second, many returning professionals are pursuing degree work on a part-time basis only and have divided loyalties between their academic roles and their professional responsibilities. In most cases, part-time students do not live in a campus setting, thus further dissociating themselves from the opportunity to experience a sense of community. Third, especially in Ed.D. and D.A. programs, students may discover that they have few professional goals in common. Unlike the traditional Ph.D. programs where an academic specialization is paramount, Ed.D. and D.A. students often find their interests too diverse to create any real sense of community.

Although there may be partial solutions to these problems, the solutions suggested are frequently political or institutional solutions, not personal solutions.

Universities and foundations may offer scholarships, assistantships, and fellowships; government may offer low interestloans, all in an effort to ease the monetary problems associated with graduate study. The universities may make their programs more accessible to wider audiences through off-campus and Saturday offerings. But these solutions alone are not sufficient, especially for problems associated with student-faculty relationships, maturity, and community. Faculty members electing to pursue individualized faculty development through formal degree programs must come to terms with these problems in some personally meaningful way.

Choosing A Degree

Once a faculty member is committed to the idea of pursuing a formal degree and has recognized the problem areas that will have to be addressed, the question still remains, which degree? If the Ph.D. has been ruled out as unsatisfactory or inappropriate, what other considerations need to be taken into account? If individuals could choose an appropriate degree program, independent of availability or monetary considerations, what factors should be considered in making the choice? First, and most important, are career goals. Do the faculty members prefer to remain in positions similar to the ones they now hold, or do they anticipate moving to different types of positions should these become available? Do they see themselves as primarily wanting to upgrade their present knowledge and skills, or do they wish to concentrate on acquiring knowledge and skills in new areas? Second, what is their perspective about their own personal and professional roles? Do they consider themselves as subject specialists whose primary concern is teaching that subject as well as they can, or do they consider themselves basically well qualified teachers of a subject who wish to improve their ability to analyze how, why, and to whom it is and should be taught? Third, what is their attitude toward study and research? Do they prefer to obtain a broad perspective on

educational problems or do they want to concentrate on a set of problems related to a given teaching field? Do they prefer to investigate educational issues from the perspective of a faculty member or a subject teacher?

Both the D.A. and the Ed.D. in College Teaching will enable instructors who plan to remain in teaching positions to increase their subject matter knowledge and teaching proficiency. As Dressel and Thompson point out, there is often little substantive difference between the D.A. and the Ed.D. in College Teaching, and both have degree components in one or more subject fields and in teaching methodology. (Dressel and Thompson, 1977) The Ed.D. in College Teaching usually has more work in education research skills than does the D.A. They both fit the traditional pattern developed for preparing primary and secondary teachers for the public schools, that is, subject matter and "education" courses. The D.A. with its accent on subject matter is closer to the pattern for preparing secondary teachers, while the Ed.D. in College Teaching follows more closely the primary pattern with somewhat more concern for work in teaching.

An Ed.D. in Post-Secondary Curriculum and Instruction, on the other hand, need not follow a traditional teacher education pattern. Since the focus is on curriculum and instruction as generic forms of organization and practice, it can be useful for those who may wish to move to academic administration in colleges or to training positions in business and industry, as well as for those who want to continue as college teachers. Individuals who care to develop a wide range of curricular and instructional skills can do so, in relation to a specific subject field or not, as they choose. Representative degree programs from several institutions are summarized below:

<u>D.A.</u>

D.A. in History, University of Northern Colorado
Major in history, 48 hours
-one primary, two secondary fields
Interdisciplinary or non-history minor, 12 hours
Courses in teaching, 6 hours (includes practicum)
Foreign language or statistics
Dissertation

Source: <u>Graduate Bulletin</u>, 1981-82

D.A. in Chemistry, University of Mississippi
Major in chemistry, 34 hours
Extra-departmental electives, 15 hours (including 6 in education)
Internship (instructional), 6 hours
Foreign language
Essay/thesis
Source: Graduate School Catalog, 1980

Ed.D. in College Teaching

Ed.D. in College Teaching, North Texas State University
Courses in education, 18 hours
Courses in teaching field, 24 hours minimum (36 hours recommended)
Electives, 18 hours
Dissertation
Source: Graduate Catalog, 1981-82

Ed.D. in College Teaching, Montana State University
Courses in education (including major, educational foundations, research), no minimum hours specified
Courses in teaching field, 24 hours
Dissertation
Source: Graduate Bulletin, 1981-82

Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction

Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (post-secondary education), Illinois State University
Courses in curriculum and instruction (p.s.e.), 21 hours
Courses in educational foundations, 9 hours
Cognate area (not in education), 9 hours
Complementary (minor) area, 15 hours
Internship
Dissertation
Source: Graduate Catalog, 1981-82

These degrees do have drawbacks, however. First of all, they lack the traditional acceptance and status accorded the Ph.D., and this may limit personal satisfaction as well as occupational mobility. The D.A. or Ed.D. in College Teaching can in practice too closely resemble degrees for primary and secondary teachers. They may come to have the worst of both worlds: not enough subject matter to satisfy disciplinary purists and not enough work in teaching to satisfy professional educators. Given the state of the art in educational research, the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction could easily become a degree with considerable form and little substance, lacking the rigor necessary for legitimate doctoral work. Alternatives to the Ph.D. do exist, but a person who wants a degree for professional development

must examine any D.A. or Ed.D. program quite thoroughly to determine if it can deliver what it promises.

The choice of a specific degree thus becomes a matter directly related to an individual's career objectives and conception of professional development. Unlike the Ph.D. which is the standard for research and the M.D., D.D.S. and J.D. which are standard degrees in the professions, choosing a particular degree best suited for professional development of college faculty remains a highly personal matter.

Role of Faculty Development Directors

The continuing of a faculty member's professional education, then, can be seen as one important and frequently neglected aspect of a meaningful staff development program. Faculty development facilitators and administrators can be of assistance to faculty members in several ways:

(1) Support the concept of individualized professional development through degree programs as a staff development activity.

(2) Know the alternatives to the Ph.D. and encourage those individuals with a genuine interest in teaching to explore further various conceptions of the Ed.D. and the D.A.

(3) Provide references, including catalogs and degree requirements, of degree granting institutions within commuting distance.

(4) Know contact persons at appropriate universities for faculty seeking information about specific programs.

(5) Secure cooperation of department/division chairpersons and other administrators in arranging teaching schedules of faculty members who would be taking courses on a part-time basis.

(6) Facilitate flexible academic leave programs tailored to the needs of individual faculty members.

(7) Provide incentives for continued efforts through recognition of special research projects, notices of attendance at professional conferences, periodic salary increments coinciding with the completion of a specified number of courses, etc.

(8) Promote special recognition within the institution and in the larger community upon completion of a degree program.

While staff development directors have many opportunities to assist faculty members, perhaps their most significant contribution could be in helping individuals to examine their own career goals and objectives, to sort through various career and degree options, and to clarify perceptions of professional and personal roles. Only after distinguishing these areas clearly is an individual faculty member prepared to make an intelligent choice among formal degree programs. After careful consideration, a faculty member may decide that the Ph.D., with its emphasis on research in a specialized area, would be an appropriate degree. For another faculty member, the D.A. or the Ed.D. in College Teaching with its emphasis on improving and extending teaching competencies would be most meaningful. Still another faculty member may find the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with the emphasis on professional practice and its examination of professional problems in curriculum and instruction would most nearly meet career goals.

Whatever the ultimate choice, staff development personnel can contribute in an important way to the careers of faculty members as they supply information regarding various degree options and assist faculty members in determining career goals and clarifying their perceptions of personal and professional roles. When the concept of individualized faculty development through formal degrees is added to the many other important functions of staff development programs, it is apparent that staff development has earned a place as an integral part of higher education in the 80's and beyond.

References

Centra, John A. (1976). Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.

Dressel, Paul L. and Thompson, Mary M. (1977). A Degree for College Teachers. Berkeley, California: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education.

Dressel, Paul L. and Thompson, Mary M. (1978). "The Doctor of Arts." Journal of Higher Education. 49:5. pp. 329-336.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. (1974). Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine.

Johnson, A. William. (1980). "Current Status of the Doctor of Arts." The Communicator. 13:4. pp. 1-2; 6-7.

JAN 8 1982

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024